UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Miguel Zubiate,

Petitioner,

-against-

United States of America,

Respondent.

USDC SDNY
DOCUMENT
ELECTRONICALLY FILED
DOC #:
DATE FILED: 2/3/22

18-cr-442 (AJN) 20-cv-9064 (AJN)

ORDER

ALISON J. NATHAN, District Judge:

The Court is in receipt of Defendant Zubiate's Motion to Vacate, Set Aside, or Correct the Sentence brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2255. Dkt. No. 125. Mr. Zubiate moves for relief on the ground of ineffective assistance of counsel.

In its opposition, the Government requests that Mr. Mitchell Elman, Mr. Zubiate's former counsel, submit an affidavit addressing the allegations of ineffective assistance of counsel made by Defendant, and that Court unseal or otherwise grant the Government access to the transcript of the *ex parte* proceedings between the Court and Mr. Elman during the January 8, 2019 conference. Dkt. No. 133 at 19; *see also* Dkt. No. 78.

The Court, after reviewing the motion papers, has concluded that Mr. Elman's testimony would assist the Government in responding to Defendant's motion and would assist the Court in resolving the motion. Moreover, by making the motion, Defendant has waived attorney-client privilege as to such communications as a matter of law. *Rudaj v. United States*, No. 04 CR. 1110-01 DLC, 2011 WL 2610544, at *3 (S.D.N.Y. June 13, 2011) ("It is well settled, however, that the assertion of a claim of ineffective assistance of counsel in a habeas petition constitutes a

Case 1:18-cr-00442-AJN Document 143 Filed 02/03/22 Page 2 of 13

waiver of the attorney-client privilege." (citing *United States v. Pinson*, 584 F.3d 972, 978 (10th

Cir.2009); United States v. Bilzerian, 926 F.2d 1285, 1292 (2d Cir.1991))).

Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED that Mr. Mitchell Elman shall give sworn

testimony, in the form of an affidavit, addressing the Defendant's factual assertions and

providing full details of his conversations with the Defendant regarding the First Plea Offer and

the Second Plea Offer, including statements by Mr. Elman and any statements by the Defendant

concerning his reason for rejecting those offers. Such affidavit shall be submitted to the United

States Attorney's Office on or before February 18, 2022. The Government's supplemental

response shall be due 14 days after the submission of Mr. Elman's affidavit.

The Court also GRANTS the Government's request to unseal the January 8, 2019 ex

parte proceedings because Defendant's motion waives the attorney-client privilege as to this

communication. Accordingly, attached to this Order is the previously sealed portion of the

January 8, 2019 transcript. See Dkt. No. 78.

The Clerk of Court is respectfully directed to mail a copy of this Order to the pro se

Defendant and note that mailing on the docket.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: February 3, 2022

New York, New York

ALISON J. NATHAN United States District Judge

2

	Xj181zubc	SEALED	
1 2	UNITED STATES DISTRICT C SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW	YORK	
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA		
4	v.		18 Cr. 442 (AJN)
5	MIGUEL ZUBIATE,		
6	Defendant	•	Ex Parte Conference
7		x	
8			New York, N.Y. January 8, 2019
9			4:16 p.m.
10	Before:		
11	HON. ALISON J. NATHAN,		
12			District Judge
13		a DDD a Daniele	
14	APPEARANCES MITCHELL C. ELMAN, ESQ. Attorney for Defendant		
15			
1617	NATALI J.H. TODD, ESQ. CJA Attorney		
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

1 (Government counsel not present)

MR. ELMAN: Want me to approach, Judge?

THE COURT: No. We'll just make sure the door is closed.

Okay. We're ex parte at this point.

Go ahead. What's the issue?

MR. ELMAN: The issues have to do -- and a lot of it has to do -- and it's not that Mr. Zubiate doesn't have respect. It's just a complete breakdown with respect to how I have advised him with respect to how this case should go and to how he has determined he thinks the case should go, and in the interim of emails that have been sent back and forth, I had asked for a co-defendant meeting with Mr. Roth several months ago --

THE COURT: Could you pull up the microphone, please.

MR. ELMAN: Yes. I'm sorry.

-- with the co-defendant, the co-defendant who's now ultimately been cooperated by the government, and just in strategies and things that I've said to Mr. Zubiate, that we just have a complete difference of opinion on the way the case has gone and going forward, and it's just -- our communication is just not there. At all.

THE COURT: So, I mean, it happens all the time; a lawyer gives his or her best advice based on his or her experience and the facts of the case. Client disagrees, takes

the advice, tells the lawyer how he wants to proceed. That's not a breakdown in attorney-client relationship. That's the lawyer's obligation then to, within the bounds of professional responsibility, proceed pursuant to the client's wishes.

MR. ELMAN: Absolutely. No question. However, he's advised that he, you know, he doesn't want me involved in his case, he certainly doesn't want me to try his case, and he wants a completely different direction on how he wants to proceed.

THE COURT: Well, that's different than what you said a moment ago.

MR. ELMAN: Well, no. It goes along the line of just his view on the case and my view on the case and that he does not want me to proceed forward with him because he disagrees with everything that I have said to him.

THE COURT: You're unable to effectuate his decision-making in the case?

MR. ELMAN: Correct.

THE COURT: Why is that?

MR. ELMAN: I don't know.

THE COURT: You don't know.

MR. ELMAN: As far as what? Maybe I'm confused on what you're asking me.

THE COURT: Well, I don't know exactly what the issue is here, but --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So one example, a hypothetical, is: A lawyer thinks his client should take a plea deal that's been offered. client says, I don't want to take a plea deal, I want to go to trial. Okay? That's not a difference of opinion which would permit the lawyer to be relieved. The lawyer's obligation then is to try the case, right?

> MR. ELMAN: Correct.

THE COURT: So that's one possibility.

Another possibility is: The client says, get me a better plea deal, and the lawyer says, I can't, and the lawyer says, either you have to take this deal or we're going to trial. And the client says, no, I'm not doing it, get me a better plea deal, or something like that, just sort of refuses to accept reality. And again, that's not a basis for withdrawing from the case. Right?

> MR. ELMAN: I agree.

THE COURT: So then the client doesn't want to take a plea; wants to exercise his right to go to trial. And then there are strategic decisions that need to be made during the course of the trial, and the lawyer gives his best advice as to how to go about doing that, counsels his client, helps him make informed decisions, for example, whether to testify or not testify, something along those lines. Again, not a basis to withdraw from the case.

MR. ELMAN: Agree on all three.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Okay. So what are we talking about? No, Mr. Zubiate has said to me, when I MR. ELMAN: wrote the letter to you, when I went to see him, there was a new plea agreement that was given by the government. I went --I was also out of town. I went just before I was leaving and went through that with Mr. Zubiate, and he said to me, I'm not interested and I want a different direction and I want different counsel. And I said, well, you have every -- I'm retained counsel. If you want to retain someone else -- and he said, no, I don't have the ability to. And he's confirmed with me that he has -- as you see, he doesn't have any family members here. Right now he has indicated to me has not spoken to his family, that he wants to go a different direction, and that he wants new counsel, and that he doesn't have the ability to hire new counsel, and this has nothing to do with funds, it has to do with the approach maybe I've taken or -- what he doesn't like or -- I don't know why. But that's what he said to me. I've been doing this 30 years. I've been a member of this bar for many years. This is the first time I've submitted this application. I'm retained counsel, and he said to me that he does not want me on his case. THE COURT: Mr. Zubiate, is that where we are? THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

concern is what's happened between -- I mean, this case came in

THE COURT: Well, I mean, the concern is timing.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

originally in July of 2018. It was before Judge Carter. got transferred to me. We had a status conference in October, and I set January 22nd as our trial date. And that's now three weeks away. The motions schedule came and went, the pretrial submission schedule came and went. I haven't received anything from you, Mr. Elman.

MR. ELMAN: No, I know that. I told Mr. Zubiate I don't think that there were relevant motions to file.

THE COURT: Okay. And then you also didn't file any of the pretrial submissions. You had no objection to the government's proposed jury instructions, proposed voir dire.

MR. ELMAN: At that point, your Honor -- I'll be frank with the Court -- I had submitted my letter.

THE COURT: You didn't request an extension of that. You just assumed you're out.

> MR. ELMAN: I apologize for that.

THE COURT: And let me just ask this straight out, Mr. Elman. You're not seeking to withdraw because your client wishes to exercise his right to go to trial, you disagree with that decision.

> MR. ELMAN: Absolutely not.

THE COURT: All right. And Mr. Zubiate, you may recall when we set our schedule -- when did you decide you no longer wished Mr. Elman to represent you? Do you recall?

THE DEFENDANT: First of all, we've been having many

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

him.

issues. Part of the issues was that I was asked to take a plea from the beginning with no discovery, and that's been my back-and-forth with him from the beginning. It's not him, but he kept -- I kept asking for my discovery, and it's always the

issue for discovery. Now all this other stuff popped up, and my first question, again: Where's the discovery? You can ask

THE COURT: By the other stuff popping up, you mean the superseding indictment?

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah, the superseding.

MR. ELMAN: By the way, to interrupt, what the government said is incorrect. They did serve new discovery after the first superseding indictment. That has not been received by Mr. Zubiate because there is a protective order in place.

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah, and then that's another issue. Me and him been back and forth over the issue with the discovery. When they finally sent the discovery, now I have a protective order. I only get to see it once a week for one hour, and then it gets canceled almost every week, in the law library. That's one issue I have back and forth with him.

Another issue we had was the motions. He said there was no motions. I didn't -- I thought there was always some type of motions to file. And I just felt, we wasn't going the right -- the same direction. I don't know, like, what was

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I always asked questions, and it's also very difficult for me to communicate with him because I know he has a lot of clients and whatever, so it's like the communication was bad, the discovery issue was like a big deal to me because I felt uncomfortable taking any plea without seeing my discovery, and that was like, as soon as that started happening, our communication was off. And it's still off, 'cause now I'm getting superseded and now it's like, all right, so where's the new discovery? There's a bunch of stuff here that's not on my -- that I don't know that's on my original discovery. So that's -- I don't know if that's something with the government or me and him. Like I guess I take it out on him every time something like that happen. I'm like, Mitch, what's up with my discovery, what's up with this, what's up with that, and I don't get it, and then --

THE COURT: Well, so it sounds like there's a number of issues.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: And you are entitled to see your discovery. There are always difficulties for incarcerated defendants with access to discovery. Protective orders make things difficult as well. But it's obviously Mr. Elman's job to explain these matters to you and tell you what the situation is, and it's your job to listen to him and try to make the decisions going forward.

So let me ask you. I mean, frankly, it doesn't feel like communications have totally broken down, but you tell me, Mr. Zubiate. You feel like you can't work with him anymore, is that where you are?

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah, 'cause honestly, ma'am, I don't know if there's something with him. I don't know. Maybe I just need a new lawyer. That's how I feel, because our communication is no good.

THE COURT: All right. Well, I'm concerned about the schedule here. This is going to be a delay, I think.

Ms. Todd.

MS. TODD: Could I make a suggestion, Judge?

THE COURT: Come forward, please.

MS. TODD: I wondered if --

THE COURT: Could you come to the mic so we could hear you. Thank you.

I think I know what your suggestion is, but go ahead.

MS. TODD: Thank you, your Honor.

I wondered if a brief adjournment might be in order so I could meet with Mr. Zubiate and have the frank conversation with him and then report back to the Court.

THE COURT: Yes. I mean, I think there's two ways we can proceed along those lines. One is, I require Mr. Elman to remain in the case during that so we can figure out whether his continued assistance is necessary in order to quickly get to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

trial, and then the other is to relieve him and have you come in and then we set a date where we'll come back and you tell me what your request is in terms of scheduling matters going forward.

Mr. Elman, I'm going to keep you in the case for now. Because I don't want to put this off for a year, or six months, and I'm concerned about the amount of time that's gone by at this stage. But I would like to bring Ms. Todd in as appointed counsel. I do have Mr. Zubiate's financial affidavit and he appears to have no assets or income, so he qualifies for the appointment of counsel. And Mr. Elman, given how far we've traveled down this road and to help ensure that we can get to trial quickly, I'm going to keep you in for now. If the request, when we come back, is for you to be relieved, I'll hear that request. All right?

MR. ELMAN: Your Honor, whatever the Court does. appreciate you accommodating. I know there's a busy schedule, and as I said to you, I thought that this was in the best interests certainly for Mr. Zubiate, and that's why. It's for no other reason.

THE COURT: Ms. Todd, you're comfortable with that arrangement?

Yes, your Honor. I'll meet with him and MS. TODD: report back to the Court.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Zubiate, I am going to

appoint Ms. Todd to represent you and for now keep Mr. Elman in the case so that we can get to trial, if that's where we're going, or other resolution as quickly as possible, but so that counsel can be prepared. Ms. Todd will meet with you, she'll get the discovery from Mr. Elman, and we'll proceed from there.

Let me bring the government back in and we'll set a schedule for a status conference.